

**Foreign Priority**

The Office Action does not acknowledge a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d), which is contained in the Declaration and Power of Attorney. Submitted herewith is a copy of the postcard receipt showing that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office acknowledged receipt of the Certified Copy of Priority Document on September 7, 2000. Acknowledgement of our claim for foreign priority and receipt of the priority document is respectfully requested.

**Status Of Application**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,190,172 to Lechner (hereinafter the "Lechner patent").

Claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lechner patent, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,579,026 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter the "Yamazaki patent").

**Drawings**

To date, no Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been received. Applicants respectfully request receipt of this document when it becomes available. Please note that the original drawings filed in the patent application are "formal" drawings.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection**

The rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Lechner patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Lechner patent shows a visual display system. This provides multiple screens (12, 14, 16, 18) to surround the user to provide a total immersion effect. A projector 28 is provided for each screen (column 6, lines 65-67). Each projector is a separate display

device (column 7, lines 9-20). The screens may have an aspect ratio of 4:3 or 3:4 (column 8, lines 10-36). The aspect ratio is the ratio of the width of the screen to the height of the screen. For each type of aspect ratio, one projector is used (column 8, lines 27-36).

In contrast to the cited prior art, claim 1 includes:

at least one display device for displaying the images that are to be projected onto the screens, a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens ...

The cited prior art shows a system using one projector for each screen. The cited prior art does not show or suggest a system where the "total number of display devices" is "smaller than a total number of screens." To anticipate, a reference must show, expressly or inherently, every element of the claim. MPEP §2131. Therefore, the cited prior art does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are also not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited prior art, claim 11 includes,

a step of installing at least one display device for displaying the images that are to be projected onto the screens, a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens

As noted above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the use of a total number of display devices that is smaller than the total number of screens. Therefore, the cited prior art does not anticipate claim 11. Claims 12-17, 19 and 20 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, claims 12-17, 19 and 20 are also not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Lechner patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

The rejection of claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Lechner patent, in view of the Yamazaki patent, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Yamazaki patent shows a system whereby viewers may view different images on the same display. A monitor 11 shows a display image that is interleaved in time (Figure 2). The viewers wear special glasses (13 and 14) that include LCD shutters. The shutter on a first pair of glasses is timed to correspond to a first image displayed by the monitor and the shutter of the second pair of glasses is timed to correspond to a second image. In this way, the viewer wearing the first image only sees the first image and the viewer wearing the second pair of glasses only sees the second image.

To demonstrate a *prima facie* case for obviousness, every element of the claim must be shown or suggested in the combined references. MPEP §2143. As noted above, the Lechner patent does not show or suggest a system having a smaller number of display devices than the number of screens. The Yamazaki patent does not remedy this deficiency. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, the cited prior art does not show or suggest every element of claims 7 and 8. Claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, the cited prior art does not show or suggest every limitation of claims 17 and 18. Thus, the cited prior art does not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness and thus claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 are non-obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lechner patent, in view of the Yamazaki patent, be reconsidered and withdrawn.